CHAPTER III.

CHĀMARĀJA WODEYAR VI, 1732-1734.

Birth, accession, etc.—Ministerial irresponsibility, March-December 1732; the *Coup d'état, c.* January 1733—The independent rule of Chamaraja Wodeyar, January 1733-June 1734—Gifts, grants, etc.—Social life—Literary activity: The *Sringararajatilaka-Bhanah, c.* 1733-1734—Domestic life—Foreign affairs: General tendencies and factors—Mysore and Malabar, 1733-1734—Internal affairs: The *First Revolution* in Seringapatam, June 1734; deposition of Chamaraja Wodeyar, June 10, 1734—Reflections.

ON THE death of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar I without issue, direct descent in the main line of the Ruling House of Mysore, branching off from Muppina-Dēvarāja Woḍeyar, came to an end. The late king had, however, desired his principal queen Dēvājamma to adopt Chāmarājaiya (son of Dēvarāja Urs of Ankanahaḷḷi), a kinsman of his aged twenty-eight (*b.* 1704), and install him as ruler in succession to himself.[1] Accordingly, soon after the demise of Krishṇarāja, Dēvājamma sent for Sarvādhikāri Nanjarājaiya, Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya, Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya (younger brother of Dēvarājaiya) and other

Birth, accession, etc.

1. *Annals*, I. 164-165. The date of birth of Chāmarāja, according to this source, is *Tāraṇa* (1704). Wilks refers to the successor of Doḍḍa-Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar as "Cham Raj" of the Hemmanahaḷḷi ("Hemmanhully") branch, and speaks of his (Chāmarāja's) having had "scarcely attained his eighteenth year" at the time of his accession (I. 251-253). Dēvachandra only writes of Chāmarāja as a lad of eighteen of the Mysore Royal Family (*Rāj. Kath.*, XII. 489). The *Mys. Rāj. Cha.* (36) merely refers to him as a descendent of Krishṇarāja I. Compare also S. K. Aiyangar (*Ancient India*, p. 307) who refers to Chāmarāja as being "connected but remotely with the ruling family." The authority of the *Annals* seems, however, more acceptable here, being obviously based on earlier succession lists and other documents of the eighteenth century.

Chāmarāja Woḍeyar VI, 1732-1734.

officers of State, and directed them to give effect to her husband's wishes. Forthwith these councillors invited Chāmarājaiya with royal honours to the capital city. At Paśchimavāhini, on his way thither, they accorded him a reception, expressing their intention of making him king if he would but rule in conformity with the behests of the dowager-queen. After thus exacting a solemn oath from the heir-elect that he would abide by their injunctions, they conducted him to the court of Seringapatam on March 7, 1732 (*i.e.*, on the third day after Krishṇarāja's death). He was next invested with regal powers, being finally adopted, and installed on the throne of Mysore, by Dēvājamma on the 19th of the same month (*Parīdhāvi, Chaitra śu.* 5).[2] Chāmarājaiya, the adopted son of Krishṇarāja Woḍeyar, thus became the ruler of Mysore under the name Chāmarāja Woḍeyar (VI), the earliest available document referring to him as such being a lithic record dated October 22, 1732.[3]

Ministerial irresponsibility, March-December 1732.

The first nine months of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar's reign constitute a period of what might be called the beginning of ministerial irresponsibility in Mysore, which in later years assumed alarming proportions. True to his pledge, Chāmarāja, during this period, conducted the

2. *Ibid*, 165-166. The *Mys. Rāj. Cha.* (l.c.) speaks of the formal accession of Chāmarāja on March 7, 1732 (*Virōdhikrit, Phālguṇa ba.* 7), *i.e.*, on the third day after Krishṇarāja's death. The *Rāj. Kath.* (l. c.) merely assigns him a period of three years' rule (1732-1734). See also and compare Wilks (l.c.) who places the accession of Chāmarāja roughly in 1731; S. K. Aiyangar (l.c.) closely follows Wilks. The authority of the *Annals*, as explained in f.n. 1 *supra*, is preferred here. For particulars about the early career, etc., of Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya, *vidē* Ch. IV, f.n. 6.

3. *E. C.*, IX Mā. 37: *ś.* 1654, *Parīdhāvi, Kārtīka śu.* 15, Friday [The week-day here seems apparently a misreading or a scribal error for Sunday, on which the *Paurṇami* actually fell (October 22, 1732)—see *Ind. Eph.*, VI. 267]. Chāmarāja Woḍeyar is referred to in this record (ll. 3-7) thus: *Śrīmadrājādhirāja rājaparamēśvara praudha pratāpa apratima-vīra-narapati Mahīśūra ratna-simhāsanārūḍharāda Chāmarāja Woḍeya-raiyanavaru.* For further particulars about the inscription, see text of f.n. 12 *infra*.

affairs of State under the guidance of the dowager-queen supported by the powerful ministerial party headed by his own councillors Sarvādhikāri Nanjarājaiya, Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya and Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya. All power and authority was being actually wielded by the two latter (members of the Kaḷale Family) who, having reduced Chāmarāja to the position of a titular ruler, began systematically to aggrandize all powers unto themselves. Out of the annual revenue dues of the kingdom, we learn, they used to appropriate 3,000 *varahas* (at 1,000 *varahas* each) for each administrative unit, and went about acquiring by this means valuable landed property all over the country. Their control soon extended over even the demesne or Palace lands from which they began to claim half the Government share of produce. At the same time, offices came to be bestowed by them on persons recommended by their favourite servants for a mere consideration. It was not, however, till about the close of 1732 that Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, having realised the gravity of the situation, and evidently apprehending trouble to himself, resolved to shake off his dependence on these councillors by removing them from office and appointing men of his own choice in their places.[4] On the secret communication of this news, Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya, we are told,[5] proceeded to queen Dēvājamma and, affecting all humility, alleged that the new king, her adopted son, had been not only effecting unjust economies in respect of certain items of expenditure in the Palace household, but also contemplating the dismissal of trusted councillors like himself with a view to their substitution by men of his own selection. He also cautioned her not to listen to representations to the contrary of Chāmarāja in the matter, and sought her permission to devise a scheme whereby Chāmarāja's efforts could be counteracted. Too credulous to probe into the

4. *Annals*, I. 166-167; cf. *Wilks*, I. 253. 5. *Ibid*, 167.

intricacies of the situation, the queen, it is added,[6] desired Dēvarājaiya to do what seemed expedient to him. Meantime, the details of the plot having been disclosed to Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, he forthwith removed both Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya and Sarvādhikāri Nanjarājaiya from the offices they held, and appointed in their place Dēvaiya, a Brāhman, and Vīra Seṭṭi, a Vaiśya. This bold counter-stroke, so sharply delivered, was followed by other changes effected equally quickly in the personnel of the administration. Gōpīnāthaiya (Gōpīnātha-Paṇḍit) became the Pradhān, while one Kaṇṭhīravaiya, Kaḍūr Chikkaiya, Nāraṇappa and Śivanappa were made councillors. This done, Chāmarāja Woḍeyar began his independent rule about January 1733.[7] The *Fort St. George Records* of 1733[8] may be taken to echo the course that internal history took in Mysore about this time when, referring to the death of the "Raja of Mysaour [Mysore]" (*i.e.*, Krishṇarāja I), they speak of his country as being "in great trouble" and "confusion."

The *Coup d'état*, c. January 1733.

The new régime set to work with vigour combined with circumspection. Young and energetic, Chāmarāja Woḍeyar soon proved himself a just ruler personally supervising the affairs of government, regulating the finances and continuing to maintain the traditions of his predecessors.[9] Among the other officials of his time, Kumāra Dēvappaiya represented at head-quarters Chikkaiya, the king's executive officer in charge of the Coimbatore sīme,[10] while Śrīnivāsa-Prabhu

The independent rule of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, January 1733-June 1734.

6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid*, 167-168; see also and compare *Mys. Raj. Cha.*, 36; cf. *Wilks*, l.c., and S. K. Aiyangar, *o.c.*, p. 308.
8. *Desp. Eng.* (1727-1733), p. 113, para 10; *Despatch* dated January 13, 1733; *Di. Cons. Bk.* (1733), p. 13: Council's *Proceedings*.
9. *Annals*, I. 167-168; cf. *Wilks*, I. 253-254.
10. See *M.E.R.*, 1925, App. A. P. 10, No. 16 (1733); also f.n. 13 *infra*.

was the chief officer of Seringapatam, the capital city.[11]

Gifts, grants, etc.

The earliest available record of the reign of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar is, as already referred to,[12] a lithic one dated October 22, 1732, which registers his gift of a village to the Goddess Chāmuṇḍēśvari. A private copper-plate charter from Coimbatore, dated June 22, 1733,[13] refers to his rule. A similar record from Venkaṭaiyanachatra, dated September 30, 1733,[14] also belongs to his reign, though his name is not found specifically mentioned in it.

Social life.

The period of independent rule of Chāmārāja Woḍeyar is, perhaps, best reflected by the contemporary work *Śringārarājatilaka-Bhāṇaḥ*[15] (*c.* 1733-1734) which refers[16] to him as the son of Krishṇarāja governing the kingdom of Mysore from the capital city of Seringapatam, also known as *Karivaradarāja-pura* (after the presiding Śrī-Vaishṇava deity Ranganātha or Karivarada of the place). The city was, during the reign, a flourishing centre of social and cultural life, adorned with richly decorated and beautiful mansions (*nilaya, saudha*), and inhabited by contented and pious families whose members were known for their attainments in sacred lore, philosophy, logic, grammar and music (played on instruments like

11. See *Śringārarājatilaka-Bhāṇaḥ*, p. 8; also f.n. 20 *infra*.
12. *Vide* f.n. 3 *supra*. A portion of the text of this record relating to the details of the gift (ll. 9-12), as published in the original, is irretrievably lost.
13. *M.E.R.*, 1925, l.c.: *K.Y.* 4834, *ś.* 1657, *Pramādīcha, Āṇi* 23, Friday. The *śaka* date as given in this Tamil record is an error for 1655. See also f.n. 10 *supra*.
14. *E. C.*, IV (2) Ch. 139: *ś.* 1655, *Pramādīcha, Aśvīja śu.* 3, Sunday.
15. *Ms.* No. 12,708 of the *Des. Cat. Sans. Mss.* (Vol. XXI) in the *Mad. Or. Lib.* The page references, cited here, are from an authenticated copy of this Ms., obtained from the Library.
16. See Prologue, pp. 1-3: *Krishṇarāya nṛpōdara vasudhābdhi sudhākarasya rājaśrī Chāmarāja rājanyasya; Mahiśūra maṇḍalākhaṇḍala Chāmarāji rājannṛkara pālita Śrīranganagara sīmā.*

the lute, tabour, etc.), and whose normal activities extended to the study and exposition of the *Vēdas* and the *Śāstras* and display of talents in dialectics and literature, and of proficiency in lute and the fine arts (like sculpture, etc.).[17] Avināśīśvara, the author of the *Śringārarājatilaka-Bhāṇaḥ*, describes himself as a disciple of one Śēshādri-Guru. He belonged to a learned family, being the grandson of Īśvara (of Vandavāśi-kula and Ātrēyasa-gōtra) and son of Śrī-Rāma by Venkaṭāmbā; Śrī-Rāma having been celebrated as an expert scholar in *Sūrya-Siddhānta* and other sciences (*Sūrya-Siddhāntādi samasta śāstra pravīṇaḥ . . . Śrī-Rāma vidushaḥ*).[18]

Literary activity: The *Śringārarājatilaka-Bhāṇaḥ*, c. 1733-1734.

Like the *Anangavijaya-Bhāṇaḥ*, noticed in an earlier chapter,[19] the *Śringārarājatilaka-Bhāṇaḥ* of Avināśīśvara, above referred to, is a dramatic piece in Sanskrit, intended to be enacted before a cultured audience on the occasion of the vernal festival of God Śrī-Ranganātha of Seringapatam, a festival which had been, we are told, stopped for some time but revived by Śrīnivāsa-Prabhu, chief officer of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, under Royal orders.[20] The play begins with invocations to Gaṇēśa, Īśvara and Manmatha, followed by the prologue (*prastāvanā*) pointing to the time, place, authorship and the circumstances under which it was written, as detailed above. The theme of the work is, as the name itself indicates, erotic, centring round the love and union

17. Pp. 1-2: *Vēda vēdānta tarka śabda mīmāmsādi . . . vīṇā mṛdanga ninada; śāstrēvā . . . paramata-dhvamsam . . . vīṇā vādaḥ . . . nigama śirō vigrahaḥ . . . sāhityasya prakaṭanam alam śilpa-vidyā vinōdaḥ.*

18. Pp. 4, 31. 19. *Ante* Ch. I: see under *Literary progress.*

20. P. 3: *Chāmarāja rājanyasyājnayā sakalādhikāra dhurandharēṇa svāmi kāryātta chitta vrittinā . . . Śrīnivāsēna tēnaiva nāmnā prakhyātēna prabhuṇā . . . chirakāla parihṛta mahōtsavasya pūjita rājīva jātādi rājarājasya Karivaradarājasya svāminaḥ punarabōdhyate nūtana Vasantōtsavaḥ*; also p. 5: *Sabhyāścha bahu sārajnāḥ.*

of two imaginary characters Madhuparāja—hero and principal interlocutor—and Santānamālā, the heroine. The major portion of the play is devoted to the painting of an idealized picture, portrayed through the principal interlocutor, of the life and manners of the times, especially as seen about the season of the Spring (April-May), when Cupid is said to sway human passions.[21] There are characteristic touches here and there, in the play, which hold up to us, as if in a mirror, the social laxities of the day. The growth of the social evil is painted for us in no uncertain manner. If unequal marriages contributed something towards this unfortunate result, there is no doubt that increase of wealth and luxury added their quota to it.[22] That is the impression that this little play produces on us. Even more piquantly suggestive in the same direction is another, but still longer, dramatic piece of this period (namely, the *Anangavijaya-Bhāṇaḥ*). Similar in point of methodology, style and diction to the *Anangavijaya-Bhāṇaḥ*, the *Śṛingāra-rājatilaka Bhāṇaḥ* illumines what is otherwise obscure in this reign. It should certainly have appealed to the popular imagination of the time as we see it described in the play itself as a means of popular entertainment (*sakalajana-manōranjakam . . . rūpakamabhinavam*).

Domestic life.

Chāmarāja Woḍeyar had three consorts, one of whom having been married to him before his accession and the other two in May 1732.[23] Dēvājamma (perhaps identical with Dēvājamma, daughter of Nanjarājaiya of Śūlagiri, referred to in the *Annals*[24]), one of these consorts, made the gift of a gold necklace (*bhangārada kaṇṭhābharaṇa*) to the Goddess Svarṇāmbikā (Honnāmbikā) in the temple of Gangādharēśvara at Śivaganga, in

21. Pp. 6-31.
22. See pp. 11-13, 16, etc.
23. *Annals*, I. 164-165.
24. I. 165.

or about October 1732.[25] Chāmarāja had, however, no issue.[26]

Foreign affairs: General tendencies and factors.

During the period covered by the reign of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar in Mysore, thus far sketched, there prevailed considerable disquiet and confusion in South India, particularly in the Karnāṭak.[27] The deaths of the Nawābs of Cuddapah and Kurnool and of Vijayaranga-Chokkanātha of Madura in 1731-32 had plunged these parts in civil wars and disputed successions. In Tanjore, Tukōji (1728-1735) had succeeded Sarfōji (1712-1727) as the ruler, though he had not yet been formally acknowledged by the Mughal. The authority of the Nāzimate of Arcot over the south was very feeble owing to the long sickness of Nawāb Sādatullā Khān in his last days. Since 1732 Mahratta raids had been a regular feature of the times in the Karnāṭak and parts of the kingdom of Mysore, including Adoni (Ādavāni), Nārāyaṇa-Peṭṭah and Bangalore (the "Vengalour" of the *Fort St. George Records*), affecting the commercial interests of the English East India Company in Southern India.[28] *The Fort St. George Records*[29] of the time speak of these raids as impeding and obstructing the inland trade of the country,

25. See *E. C., Bangalore Dist. Suppl. Vol.*, Nl. 123. The actual expressions used in the inscription (ll. 1-6) on the medallion (*padaka*) of the necklace are:

Śrī Śivagange Svarṇāmbike ammanavarige Mahiśūra samsthānada Chāmarāja Waḍeyaravara dharma-patniyavarādantha Dyāvāja ammaṇiyavara sēvārtha.

Since we have a lithic record of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, dated October 22, 1732, registering a gift of his in the Māgaḍi taluk, Bangalore district (see f.n. 3 and 12 *supra*), this gift, in the Nelamangala taluk of the same district, appears also to have been made by his consort in or about October 1732, evidently during a Royal tour.

26. *Annals*, l.c.

27. *Vide*, for general references on this section, *Desp. Eng.* (1727-1733), pp. 113, 115, paras 10, 22; *Di. Cons. Bk.* (1733), p. 13; (1734), p. 3. For specific references, see *infra*.

28. *Di. Cons. Bk.* (1733), p. 13; (1734), p. 3: Council's *Proceedings*.

29. *Ibid*; also *Desp. Eng.* (1727-1733), p. 113, para 10: *Despatch* dated January 13, 1733.

particularly the sale of broad-cloth and woollen goods. In January 1733, there were already expectations of Nizām-ul-mulk proceeding to the south to settle it.[30] Meanwhile affairs in Malabar had been tending to a crisis. As far back as 1727, Cunhi Homo, Prince Regent of the kingdom of Cotata[31] in the country of "Colastree" (or Kolattiri)[32] in Malabar, undertook to reduce to obedience the Moors[33] of the family of Alī Rājah[34] of Cannanore. Hard pressed by the

30. *Desp. Eng.* (1727-1733), pp. 113, 115, paras 10, 22: *Ibid.*

31. *Cotata*: Cotiote, Koṭṭāyatt (Mal.), adjectival form of Coṭṭāyam. Coṭṭāyam forms the northern division of Travancore, divided into 11 taluks; has more than a third of the population of the whole of the Travancore State; former head-quarters of the Coṭṭāyam rājas; now almost wholly inhabited by Syrian Christians, who form a thriving community. It is the entrepôt of all the trade to and from the Madura country to Aleppy. The taluk of Coṭṭāyam is bounded on the north by Chiracal and originally formed part of the country of the Chiracal rājas, with whom the Travancore rājas are connected. This relationship continues to be recognised to the present day. Adoptions from the northern Kolattiri (Chiracal) family are common on failure of heirs in the Travancore ruling family (*Madras Manual of Administration*, III. 230).

32. *Colastree (or Colastry)*: Portuguese form of Colattiry (Kolattiri) or Colatnāḍ. Its rāja was known as the Colattiry Rāja, the chief who ruled over *Colam* (Kollam), North Malabar. He was called *Colasvarūpam* or the Colattiri Rāja. Colattiri means holy ruler of Colam (Kollam) or North Malabar. His dynasty was known as Colam (Kollam), Kolastry, Kolatnāḍ, or North Malabar. The Colattiris were the agents of the Perumāḷs who had their head-quarters at Tiruvānjikulam in Cochin. Their jurisdiction extended over lands around Collam (Kollam) as the title signifies. On the departure of the last of the Perumāḷs to Mecca, they became independent. They are now respectively the Chiracal rājas in Malabar and the Travancore rulers.

33. *Moors*: the Moplahs (or Māpiḷḷas) are referred to in the *Fort St. George Records* by this name; supposed descendants of Arab immigrants on the West Coast. The Arab settlers were originally patronised by the Zāmorin of Calicut which, by their enterprise, became—prior to the arrival of the Portuguese in 1498—a great entrepôt of the trade between East and West. At about that time, the Zāmorin had become the ruler of nearly the whole of the country forming the West Coast.

34. *Alī Rājah*: The Moplah chief of Cannanore. The descendant of the old Sultāns of Cannanore, who goes by this name, resides here. Cannanore belonged to the Chiracal rājas—also called Colattiri rājas—and was formerly their residence. There was a quarters there called Cannatore with 390 Nambudiri homes, all of which have now become extinct. The Moplahs occupied it and their ruling family goes by the name of Alī Rājah.

enemy, the latter were induced to apply for help to the neighbouring kingdom of Ikkēri (the "Bednure" or "Canara" of the *Tellicherry Letters*), a sea-power, between whom and Cotata a strict peace had been observed for many years. Roused by the aggressions of Cotata on the borders of his country, Sōmaśēkhara Nāyaka II of Ikkēri (1715-1739), in April 1730, espoused the cause of the Moors and despatched his forces against Malabar under his general Raghunāthaiya (the "Ragounat," "Regounatt," "Ragonatt" of the *Letters*). The Prince of Cotata, foreseeing the futility of contending with his opponents, patched up a peace with the Moors but found himself unable to arrest the progress of the arms of Ikkēri (the "Cannarees" of the *Letters*), who were bent upon seizing an exceedingly rich pagoda called Tāḷiparambat,[35] situated near Mount Delly.[36] In January 1732, he allied himself with the Zāmorin of Calicut and surrounded the enemy. The latter, however,

35. *Tāḷiparambat*: A place of pilgrimage in Chiracal taluk, Malabar district; so called after the chief temple of Colatnāḍ; head-quarters of a Deputy Tahsīldār; 13 miles from Cannanore; has three ancient temples known as Kanniyarangād, Tāḷiparamba and Trichambaram. It is situated on the river of the same name (Tāḷiparamba), which, rising from the lower slopes of Western Ghāṭs, passes through Tāḷiparamba; the main branch is here joined by one from the east, and the two together spread out into an extensive sheet of water. Bending slightly to the north and passing under a ruined fort of Colattiri, the united streams then suddenly turn at Payyangādi, due south, and run parallel to the sea till they meet the Billiapatam river—referred to below—united to which they force themselves a passage to the sea through the sand shoals thrown up by the littoral currents. A large tract of fertile garden has been formed by the continuous action of the littoral currents damming up the mouth of this river. The river is about 51 miles in length. The main branch is navigable at all seasons for boats as far as the lower slopes of the Ghāṭ mountains.

36. *Mount Delly*: Lit. Rat-Hill; also called *Saptaśaila* or seven hills. Portuguese travellers styled it Mount D'Eli; hence the corruption into Delly. A detached hill forming a prominent landmark, visible 27 miles at sea. There are creeks on either side, the junction of which make it an island. Once a noted place for pirates. This was the first Indian land seen by Vasco da Gama. A project for the construction of a harbour here was abandoned on account of expense. The modern fort was built on a bluff projecting into the sea by the Portuguese.

succeeded in putting their opponents to rout and pursuing their conquests as far as Billiapatam river,[37] where they raised a fortification. In October, the Prince was obliged to sue for peace with Raghunāthaiya, not only agreeing to pay an annual contribution to the chief of Ikkēri but also permitting him to build three forts in Malabar in return for securing his help in the reduction of the Moors of Cannanore, who had even attempted his assassination.[38] On the conclusion of this peace, the course of politics in Malabar assumed a new turn. Cannanore became the objective of the Prince of Cotata. Early in January 1733 the combined armies marched on thither and, on the 8th, began operations by making a vigorous attack on the southernmost fort of the Moors called Codallay, from which the allies were repulsed with loss. This was, however, followed by the siege of Cannanore itself, towards the close of January. The Moors put up a stout opposition, giving the struggle the colour of a religious war in consequence of one of their priests—highly revered amongst them—having been put to death

37. *Billiapatam river*: Otherwise known as Neytarpoya river; rises with the Lakshmaṇatīrtha and the Pāpanāśi in the Brahmagiri hills in the Kiggaṭnāḍ of Coorg where it is called the Barapoḷe. It flows for several miles in almost a straight line and then westwards through the Malabar district into the Arabian Sea; unites with the Tāḷiparamba river at the port of Billiapatam. Its upper course lies amid deep gorges and wild forest scenery, one of its tributaries falling over a perpendicular rock of great height, forming a cascade near Coḍiyāl Coffee Estate.

38. *Letters. Telli.* (1732-1733), p. 61: *Letter* dated July 19, 1733; also pp. 7-8: *Letter* dated December 11, 1732. The name of Raghunāthaiya—spelt as "Ragounat," etc., in the *Tellicherry Letters* noticed above—is mentioned in the list of officers of Sōmaśēkhara Nāyaka II of Ikkēri (1715-1739), as given in the *Ke. N. V.* (X. 196, f.n. 1). This work, however, has no detailed account of the Nāyaka's relations with Malabar, beyond the reference to his confinement of certain English factors whom he had found to be intriguing with the Nairs (X. 188, v. 67: *Duruḷaraha Nāyimārara nuru kūḍisi kuhakageyyutiha kumbaḷeyavara sāmantaranure piḍitarisute durgaḍoḷagankeyam māḍisidam*). Cf. *Impl. Gaz.* (XVII. 57) which refers to the invasion of the country of Kolattiri, and the imposition of fines on the northern division, by the Rāja of Ikkēri or Bednūr in 1736. In the light of the *Tellicherry Letters*, above cited, we have to infer that the relations of Ikkēri with Malabar began as early as 1730.

by the troops of Ikkēri.[39] The siege (of Cannanore) was protracted during 1733-1734 and became complicated by the Anglo-French-Dutch rivalry on the West Coast on the one side and the troubled internal state of Malabar on the other. In particular, the aggressions of the well-organized and promising sea-power of Ikkēri in the Malabar country and her long presence in Cannanore became a source of suspicion and alarm alike to the local princes and the English factors at Tellicherry, whose pepper trade (for which they had acquired special privileges from the Nair rulers of Cotata, Calicut and other places) was being considerably affected in consequence. Since January 1733, it accordingly became the key-note of the policy of the English to devise measures—in their own interests, no less than in the interests of their rivals, the French—for drawing off the Prince of Cotata from his ally by endeavouring to effect a peace with the Moors, to organize all the country powers (including the Moors) into a confederacy headed by the Prince, to lead them in expelling from Malabar the army of Ikkēri regarded as the common enemy, and to secure French support for the project by means of a treaty.[40] In 1733, sanguine in the expectations of assistance from the English, a confederacy of local powers (including the Zāmorin, the Heads of Tāḷiparambat, etc.), led by the Prince of Cotata, began to work actively against Ikkēri. At the same time the

39. *Ibid*, pp. 6, 19-21, 26-27 and 40: *Letters* dated November 21, 1732, January 3, 14, 24, and February 22, 1733.

40. *Ibid*, pp. 6, 8, 14, 20-23, 27-30, 33, 36-41; 45-46, 49-50, 52, 57-59, 62-63, 68-70: *Letters* dated November 21, December 11, 1732, and January 3, 10, 14, 24, February 9, 13, 22, 28, March 13, April 3, 8, May 29, June 20, July 19, and September 15, 1733. "The French first settled at Calicut in 1698. In 1726 they obtained a footing at Mahe . . . The English established themselves in 1664 at Calicut, in 1683 at Tellicherry, and in 1684 at Anjengo, Chetwai and other commercial factories. Tellicherry became their chief entrepôt for the pepper trade and so rapid was the extension of their power and influence that in 1737 the English factors mediated a peace between the Princes of Kanara and Kolattiri. They obtained the exclusive privilege of purchasing the valuable products of the country, namely, pepper, cardamoms and sandal wood." (*Impl. Gaz.*, l.c.).

position of the latter in Malabar was becoming critical in the extreme on account of the fatigue, expense and hazard of the siege of Cannanore; the futility of her negotiations with the English for concluding a peace with the Moors and the pressure of Nizām-ul-mulk on her. Apprised as she was of the real intentions of her ally (the Prince of Cotata) and of the country powers and the English, there was every prospect of Ikkēri withdrawing herself from the siege and entering on an intensive campaign of carrying fire and sword in the Malabar country.[41]

Mysore and Malabar, 1733-1734.

The course of affairs in Malabar, thus far described, had its repercussions on Mysore under Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, referred to in the *Tellicherry Letters* of the time as "the King of Misure [Mysore], an inland power" and "a profest enemy of the Carnatick Rajah [Sōmaśēkhara Nāyaka II of Ikkēri]."[42] Already towards the close of the reign of Chikkadēvarāja Woḍeyar, as we have seen,[43] Mysore had shown a tendency to advance in the direction of Malabar and made an impression on the ruling chiefs of that region as a power to reckon with. Accordingly, about February 1733, the Prince of Cotata, in his project against Ikkēri, sought the assistance of Mysore in horse and foot "who," it is said, "have been long expected."[44] Early in February, "a party of men, with some of the ministers of the King of Misure . . . were come into the King of Cotata country, offering such a force of horse and foot as might be thought sufficient to compell the Cannarees [Ikkērians] to leave the Mallabar countrey, and in consideration of which a very considerable

41. *Ibid*, pp. 36-37, 39, 41, 45, 49, 52, 55, 59, 69 and 71: *Letters* dated February 13, 28, March 13, April 3, 8, May 19, June 20 and September 15, 1733.
42. *Ibid*, p. 33: *Letter* dated February 9, 1733. The reference to the professed enmity between Mysore and Ikkēri is in keeping with the position of the local sources, developed in the earlier chapters of this work.
43. *Ante*, Vol. I, Ch. XI.
44. *Letters. Telli.* (1732-1733), p. 49: *Letter* dated April 3, 1733.

sum of money was demanded by them from the Heads of the Pagoda of Talliperumbutt." [45] By March, "the King [of Mysore] had agreed to joyn the confederacy, and to furnish one thousand horse and five thousand foot, which with the forces of the countrey could not fail of producing success." [46] By April, "one thousand horse and a number of foot" were expected on the confines of the dominions of Cotata.[47] Since May, "through the application made by the Heads of the Pagoda Talliparambutt, five hundred horse and two thousand foot of the Misure forces" were actually in the King of Cotata's country, with an expectation of an additional reinforcement of 500 horse and 3,000 foot, whose services had been engaged from the first of April for "twenty-five thousand pagodas of thirteen and a half fanams each per month." [48] In October 1733, contrary to the articles of their treaty with the English, the French at Māhe attempted, through M. Louet, "concluding a peace between the Cannarees and Moors" with views presumably "of grasping the pepper trade about Agar and Billiapatam to themselves." [49] Their activities, however, were counteracted by the English who only found in the Dutch a serious competitor demanding from the Moors the delivery to them of the fort of Codallay.[50] These developments, it would appear, told heavily on the Prince of Cotata who, by December 1733, had begun to show signs of apathy in his design against Ikkēri and, "for want of a due confidence in his confederates," we are told, was "busy in robbing them of what money he could," giving trouble to the English and plundering the

45. *Ibid*, p. 33: l.c.
46. *Ibid*, p. 45: *Letter* dated March 13, 1733; also *Telli. Cons.* (1732-1733), p. 47: *Letter* dated March 6, 1733.
47. *Ibid*, pp. 49, 52 and 56: *Letters* dated April 3, 8 and May 19, 1733.
48. *Ibid*, pp. 57 and 62: *Letters* dated May 29 and July 19, 1733.
49. *Ibid* (1733-1734), pp. 2-3, 7 and 17: *Letters* dated October 31, December 6 and 29, 1733.
50. *Ibid*, p. 7: *Letter* dated December 6, 1733.

merchants of his country.[51] At the same time, there prevailed a belief that the Mysore forces were being secretly engaged in the interests of Raghunāthaiya of Ikkēri.[52] Though the situation seemed favourable for the expulsion of Ikkēri from Malabar, by January 1734 the confederacy itself began to dwindle away owing primarily to the Prince's jealousy of the country powers, their fickleness, and the covert removal by the Heads of the Tāḷiparambat, of the greatest part of their treasure lodged in the Cotata country.[53] During January-March, disappointed in his expectation of financial assistance from his confederates (particularly the Heads of Tāḷiparambat), the Prince of Cotata was in the utmost straits, unable to meet the heavy arrears due to the Mysore forces in his country, who had been kept inactive since May 1733. He began, therefore, systematically to put off the issue.[54] Meanwhile, French intrigues with the Prince and with Raghunāthaiya continued to be active, adding to the concern of the English.[55] Early in April 1734, the situation in Cotata became serious. The Mysore troops, in the language of the *Letter from Tellicherry*,[56] "became so impatient that they marched inland to a small fortress where he [the Prince] had retired to, pressing for their pay; but the (? they) Mallabar like fired on them, and the country flocking to his assistance, they made a disorderly retreat to the buzar of Cotata, with the loss of severall of their men, and not thinking themselves safe there, they exprest a contentment to depart, being permitted so to do, and advanced up to the Hills, where the passages are very narrow and difficult to ascend, many of them were . . . picked off by a party of the King's people, and what little they had saved taken from them."

51. *Ibid*, pp. 7-8: l.c.
52. *Ibid*, p. 8: l.c.; also p. 13: *Letter* dated December 27, 1733.
53. *Ibid*, pp. 20-21, 23: *Letters* dated January 9 and 17, 1734.
54. *Ibid*, pp. 23, 28 and 45: *Letters* dated January 17, February 23 and April 8, 1734.
55. *Ibid*, p. 23: l.c. 56. *Ibid*, p. 45: l.c.

Though the alliance of the Ruling Prince of Cotata with Mysore—on which there is so far very little light from the Mysore side—was thus an ill-fated one, it is of considerable interest to us throwing as it does sidelights on the kingdom of Mysore, during the period of the independent rule of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar (1733-1734), as an important inland military power figuring in the complicated foreign politics of the times. It was, however, about two months after the return of the Mysore army from the Malabar country that an event of far-reaching consequences took place in the capital city of Seringapatam, to which we have necessarily to advert now.

Internal affairs: The *First Revolution* in Seringapatam, June 1734.

However just and beneficial was the independent rule of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar since January 1733, his domestic policy during the period tended to become a source of trouble to himself. Under the liberal but ill-controlled management of the dowager-queen, there were opportunities for reckless expenditure in the Royal household. Chāmarāja Woḍeyar attempted to minimise them, consistently with economy and expediency. This naturally resulted in considerable discontent among the officials in the personal service of the dowager, before whom they began to ventilate their grievances in a manner prejudicial to Chāmarāja. The queen took them at their word, being confirmed in her innocent belief by the previous allegations of Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya against Chāmarāja Woḍeyar. The situation proved eminently advantageous to all the three officers of the former regime (namely, Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya, Sarvādhikāri Nanjarājaiya, and Karāchūri Nanjarājaiya) who, smarting under their recent removal from office and believing Chāmarāja to be in the full know of all their doings, were driven to the necessity of organizing a plot to subvert his rule.[57] One night, about June 1734,

57. *Annals*, I. 168. Compare this source (cited here and in f.n. 58-61 *infra*).

we are told,[58] they covertly made their way to the camp of the Mysore army outside the Seringapatam fort, and approached Jamādār Gulām Haidar Alī (uncle of the future Nawāb Haidar Alī Khān Bahadūr) and other military officers, then serving under Mallarājaiya of Maddagiri. Having won them over by their ill-gotten wealth, and holding out to them better prospects in their own employ, they incited them, by fair words, to have their dues disbursed to them by the Seringapatam Government and quit the service of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar. Shortly after, a contingent of 2,000 horse and 6,000 foot, on the disbursement of their pay, left the Mysore army and encamped at a distance of about three miles from the capital. On receipt of this news, Dēvarājaiya raised a loan of rupees two lakhs from a local merchant by name Jagannātha Dās and advanced it to the soldiery, requiring them to be ready for the emergency. It was the custom of the times for the Mysore army, runs the narrative,[59] to proceed on a march every Friday to the parade ground, at a distance of about six miles from the fort of Seringapatam, to conduct military exercises. One Friday (*i.e.*, on June 7, 1734), Daḷavāi Dēvaiya, as usual, led on the major portion of his forces outside the fort. At this long-expected opportunity, the ex-Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya gave the signal for his mercenaries to assemble, blocked up the return passage of the Mysore troops by posting his own guards over the main entrance to the fort, and, accompanied by an armed retinue, made a sally into the capital city and stood before the very gates of the Palace. Astounded at these developments, continues the account,[60] Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, unarmed and helpless, sent word to Dēvarājaiya explaining the course of affairs leading to his

with the authorities noticed in f.n. 61 *infra*. The circumstances connected with the revolution of 1734 in the kingdom of Mysore are described in the *Annals* with a genuineness of local knowledge and a depth of insight into human nature, which it is hard to ignore.

58. *Ibid*, 169. 59. *Ibid*, 169-170. 60. *Ibid*, 170.

misunderstanding with his former councillors and promising, in all humility, to govern the kingdom solely with their consent, if they would only desist from their proceedings. But all his importunities were in vain. Determined to push matters to the extreme, Dēvarājaiya, with the aid of an elephant named *Rāmabāṇa*, dashed to pieces the principal gate (*āne bāgilu*) of the Palace and, having secured his position at the entrance, sent in a jamādār by name Nāgōji Rao. Then were the insignias of state wrested from Chāmarāja Woḍeyar and placed on the throne. And on June 10, 1734 (*Ānanda, Jyēṣṭha ba. 5*), the narrative concludes,[61] Chāmarāja was formally deposed and despatched with his family under an escort to the prison of Kabbāḷ-durg—not far from Sēringapatam—where, under the dreadful insalubrity of the climate, he passed away not long after. His departure from the capital city, which was agonizing in the extreme judging from the bitter curses he is said to have pronounced on his captor Dēvarājaiya, was followed by the arrest and imprisonment of the seven councillors of his choice, including Daḷavāi Dēvaiya, Sarvādhikāri Vīra Seṭṭi and Pradhān Gōpīnāthaiya.

Deposition of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar, June 10, 1734.

Thus disappears from history Chāmarāja Woḍeyar in his thirtieth year, after a reign of but two years and three months—the first nine months under the sway of the councillors of the Kaḷale House and the next eighteen in

Reflections.

61. *Ibid*, 170-171. The *Mys. Rāj. Cha.* (36-37) contains a very brief but rather suspicious account of Chāmarāja Woḍeyar's rule. This work generally extols the Daḷavāis of the Kaḷale Family and would maintain that Chāmarāja himself resigned the kingship, having, under the evil influence of his new councillors, misgoverned for a period of two years and three months. It has not a word about the conduct of the members of the Kaḷale House and the king's deposition by Dēvarājaiya. On the other hand, even the *Rāj. Kath.* of Dēvachandra (XII. 489) would have it that the differences between the Daḷavāis and the king led to the confinement, and subsequently death, of Chāmarāja at Kabbāḷ-durg. See also and compare Wilks, I. 253-255, and S. K. Aiyangar, *o.c.*, p. 308.

an independent capacity. The promising young ruler that he was, considerable pathos centres round his deposition, in bringing about which the conduct of Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya cannot but be adjudged treacherous and disloyal to a degree. There is little doubt that Chāmarāja proved himself to be of too independent a turn of mind to consent accepting for ever the position of a titular king, intended for him by the all-powerful, ambitious and self-seeking members of the ministerial family. Without ignoring the accusations of his enemies,[62] there is reason to believe that Chāmarāja was both imprudent in the measures he adopted to obtain control of the sovereignty and ill-advised in the administrative policy he chalked out for himself immediately he asserted his independence. For one thing, he left at large the ministers whom he had displaced. Next, the zeal he displayed for economy was misplaced as it helped the dismissed councillors to make common cause with the dowager who was none too pleased with him. The unpopularity to which he was subjected was fanned to flame by the old ministers, who thus found means to regain their lost power. Yet his character was not devoid of merit, nor did his Government deserve the contempt of his people or the curses of his ministers. From the story of his rule, as narrated above, we are informed of his impatience at the unworthy conduct of his advisers; of the uncommon plenty of the times; of the peaceful social life led by the people; of the flourishing character of the capital city of Seringapatam, and of his desire to rule manfully as a king rather than continue to be a craven in perpetual tutelage and under the eternal control of his selfish ministers. And we know, too, from other and authentic sources that he maintained the army in a well-organized state, able indeed to go to the aid of a neighbouring chief in a time of distress.

62. See f.n. 61 *supra*.

The pathetic end of Chāmarāja's life shows that he could not have gained the love, much less the confidence, of his adoptive mother, the dowager-queen. She carried out, no doubt, the wish of her husband, and probably was not unwilling to allow him (Chāmarāja) to take a passive share in the administration. But the new king attained soon maturity of judgment; the maternal yoke became increasingly grievous; and the control of the ministers both irritating and unbearable. He liked to listen to men of his own age, who probably desired not so much to share his pleasures as his power. Their arguments convinced him of his right, their praises of his ability to reign; and he made up his mind to reward the good-will of his adoptive mother by decreeing her virtual deposition. But her ambition, if not her vigilance, easily disconcerted his rash projects; and a similar, if not more severe, punishment was retaliated on him and his advisers. A powerful conspiracy was formed for her own restoration, and the erstwhile ministers faithfully kept the secret above a year, till the time arrived for its easy execution. Shortly after the return of the forces from Malabar, they found their opportunity. They cajoled the army into acceptance of their evil designs, seized the king, made him dismount the throne on which they had put him, and transported him to the deadly hill-fortress from which he was never to return. In the heart of the dowager (who, of course, belonged to the same family as Daḷavāi Dēvarājaiya and his colleagues), ambition had stifled every sentiment of humanity and filial love; and she seems to have even tacitly given her consent to the decree of the secret council that Chāmarāja should be removed from the throne and rendered incapable of it. The unhappy prince lingered a while with his wife—joint captives in Kabbāḷ-durg, escape from which was impossible—oppressed by the queen and forgotten by his subjects. His disappearance was, as we shall

see, the signal for another adoption and the setting up of an infant on the throne, who could neither control the ex-ministers come back to power, nor stand in the way of what they desired to do. The conduct of the queen was evidently justly reprobated by her people, who would not submit themselves to her personal rule and naturally welcomed the change brought about. Nor did she, in her credulity, realize the extent of her crime, a crime which can only be paralleled, if at all, in the history of royal crimes, to that of Irene, the queen of the Romans and mother of Constantine VI (780-797). The men whom she had joined not only ruined her reputation but subverted the State itself. They had set an example which was destined to have consequences far too serious both to themselves and to the country at large. It opened the way to ambitious adventurers aiming at the throne, and hypocrisy, ingratitude and avarice gaining the upper hand in the counsels of the State to its utter detriment. In short, the Kalale Family had come to assert itself and became the arbiter of the destiny of the kingdom of Mysore.